

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
July 9, 2013
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Deeds, Jacobson, Gieseke, Steel, Cella, Jones, Dan Peterson.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Jacobson, Gieseke, Steel, Cella, Jones, Dan Peterson.
Motion carried.

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

~~IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of June 11, 2013~~

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

IV.A. REGULAR PARK BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 2013 – APPROVED AS AMENDED.

Chair Steel made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, correcting the regular meeting minutes of June 11, 2013, page three, paragraph 10, during Chair Steel’s discussion of accessibility to parks via sidewalks, add the phrase: “because the policy only talks about every child’s access to a school, not a park”.

Chair Steel requested a second change on page four, paragraph one, immediately after the phrase “Chair Steel asked about putting in a pedestrian bridge” to add: “for the Richfield School District children”, followed by the existing “to access Strachauer Park”, with a final addition of: “since the closest park is Rosland in that area”.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Jacobson, Gieseke, Steel, Cella, Jones, Dan Peterson.
Motion carried.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Cella, approving the regular minutes of June 11, 2013, as corrected.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Jacobson, Gieseke, Steel, Cella, Jones, Dan Peterson.
Motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None.

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. 54th Street and Arden Park Stormwater Management Plan

Ms. Kattreh introduced the two consultants present to assist in the discussion, Paul Pasko and Caitlin Badger.

Mr. Pasko introduced Ms. Badger noting she will provide an overview of the 54th Street project as well as the Stormwater Management Plan. She noted the first topic under discussion is 54th Street from Wooddale to France and she asked for the Park Board to raise issues and questions of concern.

Mr. Pasko noted that tonight's meeting is not the time for offering solutions, but rather is primarily about getting questions and concerns on the table.

Member Gieseke asked about the issue of access to the creek, specifically those wanting to canoe, as well as parking space challenges. He also brought up traffic issues in the area.

Member Jones brought up the issue of access safety thinking, specifically getting out of the water safely and getting from one side to the other safely.

Member Deeds brought up trail access and float access, as well as improved aesthetics in the area.

Member Cella asked about impact on the parkland that is already present. Mr. Pasko stated that is still undetermined. The emphasis for 54th Street seems to be on the right-of-way; everything is on the table as data is collected.

Member Dan Peterson asked if Arden Park is part of a flood plain. He recalled that over 30 years ago the city installed a bigger, better bridge. He also asked what legal entities will be involved. Mr. Pasko responded that Minnehaha Creek Watershed District is involved as well as the DNR and the Corp of Engineers.

Member Dan Peterson brought up the issue of limited parking as well as speeding. He noted that he has also seen kids fishing in that area.

Member Deeds asked about the amenities at Arden Park to which Ms. Kattreh responded there is a hockey rink, free-skating rink, shelter building, canoe landing, playground and a trail through the park.

Chair Steel stated she used to tube down there quite a bit when she was younger, especially when she was a nanny for two younger kids. The main issues were finding a spot to park bikes and getting there safely while both walking and biking.

Member Deeds stated this might be an opportunity to use potential native filtration, marshes, plants and other things that would encourage wildlife around the park.

Member Jones stated it looks as if the area north of the bridge is flooded.

Mr. Pasko summarized that one question might be how to make the flood waters a feature rather than an impediment when they are present.

Member Jones stated the bridge is not wide enough for pedestrians, bikes and cars. It would be ideal to not have a bike lane disappear while getting on the bridge.

Member Deeds encouraged thinking about how to get off the bridge. He stated it is a safety and aesthetic issue. The more the bike lanes can be separated from the walking paths the better.

Mr. Pasko noted that on Minnetonka Boulevard there is a separate bridge of 10 or 15 feet for bikes only.

Chair Steel asked if there is a lot of biking activity for children in that area to which Ms. Kattreh replied there are some bikes going through there. The majority of activity she has seen is mothers with strollers as well as dog walkers.

Chair Steel asked about the trail composition and Ms. Kattreh responded it is asphalt.

Member Deeds stated there is a larger discussion in the city about bike paths, so what happens here should be built in consideration of those discussions of the non-auto-based transportation system.

Member Gieseke stated there is a greater need for recreational programming.

Member Jones stated there are a lot of needs for the park but that can be left for future discussion of aging shelter buildings. All research shows it is good to put in painted lanes on streets, but those painted lanes do not increase the number of people biking. The way to increase biking is to have protected bike lanes. She noted that is a very narrow street and as a mother she is not sure about the comfort level of letting children biking on that street. She encouraged the design to have either protected bike lanes or a wide enough sidewalk to be a multi-use trail. She wants people to feel comfortable about biking to parks and to the Edina Aquatic Center.

Member Cella echoed comments about a separate biking trail, particularly since 54th Street takes traffic from east to west in Edina and is used significantly during rush hour for commuter traffic.

Member Jacobson brought up the issue of being very purposeful about lighting, as there is currently not a lot of lighting in that area. Member Deeds stated it is important to have properly focused lighting, as there is often so much energy wasted in street lighting.

Mr. Pasko stated as plans start to take shape, he encouraged the Park Board to consider the long-term plan of the park. That will impact where things get placed.

Member Jones stated as far as she knows there are no plans for design on the park. The shelter building is at least 20 years old. Ms. Kattreh stated it was probably built in the 1970s.

Member Cella suggested there should be a subcommittee to think through the park layout.

Chair Steel stated this is a unique feature and she would like to see what the consultants can propose and then what can be accommodated in the city's plan.

Member Jones noted that the Park Board has never had this opportunity during a street reconstruction to make comments, so this is unusual. This is a time when the city is bringing the community together to discuss needs and desires with respect to streets. This may also be a good time to re-evaluate parks. It may be that this is a perfect time for the community to say what they would like in their parks so that plans for redevelopment of neighborhood parks can have the same type of calendar for streets. Both streets and playgrounds have approximately 20-year life cycles, so perhaps they could be scheduled on a similar timeline.

Ms. Badger stated feedback is being collected on the park as well and that information will be available to the city for now or later.

Member Gieseke noted that the River Walk in San Antonio has interesting, bold ideas that could be incorporated, whether it is a boardwalk, seasonal entertainment or a community gathering space.

Member Jones stated it looks like the street has already been reconstructed to France. Mr. Pasko noted that a few years back curb and gutter were added and there was an overlay rather than a complete reconstruction.

Ms. Badger thanked the Park Board for their feedback. She encouraged any further comments or concerns as they may come to mind.

Mr. Pasko concluded with a brief overview of the timeline of the projects moving forward.

VI.B. Sports Dome and Athletic Field Recommendation

Ms. Kattreh introduced Susie Miller, Braemar Arena Manager, who has worked on the pro forma for the Sports Dome and provided a lot of information on the potential for an outdoor refrigerated rink.

Ms. Kattreh also introduced Kathy Wallace, an architect from the Cunningham Group, who has provided architectural services for the Sports Dome as well as the Golf Dome.

Ms. Kattreh outlined the four renderings of the options for the Sports Dome, noting all options are at the Braemar athletic field site. Options A and C, as outlined in the Power Point presentation and board packet, are the two viable options still under consideration, as Options B and D were quickly eliminated from consideration. She noted the details are not yet worked out with the Fire Department. Staff believes there is sufficient room to meet fire code requirements, but some adaptations might be needed as the process moves along.

Ms. Kattreh noted staff was pleased to find out that the cost estimates do not vary much between Options A and C; the range is \$5.3 million to \$6 million, with an approximate additional \$2 million for a refrigerated outdoor ice rink.

Ms. Kattreh noted they wanted to maximize the space available and also allow for a wider field, making it more marketable and with the ability to run games east/west as well as north/south.

Member Cella asked about the additional costs for Option C. Ms. Kattreh noted those costs are higher due to the retaining walls and grading as well as a higher cost in the extra fabric in a 250-foot dome.

Member Jacobson asked whether plans include a walking or running track around the edge to which Ms. Kattreh responded affirmatively. She noted it would be very similar to the Maple Grove dome, which was included in the Park Board packet.

Ms. Kattreh noted that the costs presented in the report are just construction costs and do not include anything related to operations. The included pro forma covers operational revenues and expenses. She stated the goal for this pro forma was to ensure the dome would be sustainable without additional funding from the city. Therefore, staff has discussed with Edina athletic associations implementing a \$30 per participant priority use fee for scheduling the dome. She has worked with Lacrosse, Soccer, Baseball, and Football to agree to give them priority scheduling of the dome, with the \$30 per person fee, which would guarantee the City \$95,310 in annual dome operations. Staff will also go out to secure non-Edina groups, but this was a way to secure finances with groups who have the most interest in the dome.

Ms. Kattreh discussed a variety of future programming options as well as the business plan to develop relationships with non-residents who will use the dome.

Chair Steel asked about the possibility of event rentals at the dome. Ms. Kattreh responded affirmatively, noting rentals are something that will be considered for the dome. She also noted that over 15 years the priority use access fees would accumulate to over \$1.4 million.

Chair Steel encouraged the priority use policy to be created in such a way to encourage equity, with the goal of avoiding some of the same difficulties being faced right now.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that at the guidance of Parks and Recreation consultants, staff worked with the athletic associations to revise and enhance the pro forma. She highlighted some of those changes, noting the expenses are conservative and revenues are confirmed. The hours and schedule are confirmed as well as the priority use fee. She also noted that at year 15 the dome will have reached a 115% cost recovery.

Chair Steel asked about the ages of players and whether there will be enough space for families to visit, particularly as it relates to playgrounds or other amenities. Ms. Kattreh stated there will be a wide age range of players from little kids to older kids. She pointed out the site might be very tight if the option that eliminates the current playground is selected; however, amenities are something to consider. She noted there is a very welcoming common area and concession stand for parents who might want to hang out while kids are practicing.

Discussion ensued regarding the life expectancy of the turf and the dome itself and whether the sinking fund would be able to cover those replacement costs.

Ms. Kattreh discussed the outdoor refrigerated rink, and that the east arena needs to be switched from R22 to ammonia for refrigeration by the year 2020. She noted the pro forma is based upon a 17-week season though favorable weather would allow for a 19-week season.

Member Deeds asked about a warming house. Ms. Kattreh responded staff has not vetted all the options, including a heated bench, a roof, and access to restrooms.

Member Cella asked whether an additional outdoor piece of ice was on the original list of priorities. Ms. Kattreh responded that it was not, though staff wanted to ensure they did not miss out on any opportunities and wanted to at least consider any options while working with the consultants.

Member Jacobson asked whether the ice rink area can be used for a potential field in the summer. Ms. Kattreh stated a concrete base will give the rink the longest life; some cities use it as a BMX or a skateboard park.

Member Jones asked what makes up the \$2 million price tag for the ice rink. Ms. Kattreh explained a large portion of it would be connecting the refrigeration mechanism from the east arena as well as the rink, as well as tubing, boards, engineering and architect fees and other soft costs. She stated the \$2 million is a realistic cost unless something like a roof over the ice arena is considered.

Member Jacobson asked how this would impact the scheduling issues with the hockey and figure skating club. Ms. Kattreh said it might help alleviate the situation, but would not solve it as hockey rents such a large number of hours.

Member Deeds asked about space for parking if the dome and ice rink are fully booked. Ms. Miller replied the big high school games present the most parking challenges, which happen about six times per season.

Ms. Kattreh noted there might be a 10 percent savings if one construction contract included both the dome as well as the outdoor refrigerated rink. Various possible economies of scale were discussed.

Chair Steel stated choices need to be made regarding whether this is a great place for kids and parents to come together or whether it is just a place for kids to be dropped off. Those other possible amenities could be discussed down the road.

Ms. Kattreh asked the Park Board to voice whether there is interest in the outdoor refrigerated ice.

Member Deeds stated the dome and the athletic field improvements are top priority. He stated most of the problem is that most of the fields are not built to withstand most of our weather and are not built to drain.

Member Jones thanked staff for thinking about the outdoor ice rink; she does not know where it fits in with the priorities of Braemar Arena and whether this is a need that should be acted on this year and whether there is funding for it. She is intrigued by it, since other communities do have a lot of ice time, but she does not know if this is going to be in the budget.

Ms. Kattreh noted that ties in with Member Deeds' point – if there was \$2 million to spend, should it be spent on an ice rink or spent on renovating five athletic fields?

Member Cella commented that renovating more fields is a priority over ice. But if plans for the dome proceed, it makes sense to leave space for the ice rink.

Member Gieseke asked whether discussions have been had with the hockey folks who are raising money for the Hornet's Nest. Ms. Kattreh stated no, those conversations have not been had due to lack of time, but it is a good idea.

Ms. Kattreh stated one point worth noting is that if the city is going to put a rink there, it is an ideal location because it is very shaded and protected. Member Deeds stated the space should definitely be reserved for an ice rink, but the timing is unknown.

Ms. Kattreh indicated staff has spent time studying the current field use and field needs and has determined there is a need for a minimum of two full-sized rectangular fields. Sometimes associations limit numbers of players because of lack of field availability; city programming is also limited due to field space limitations. Inclement weather significantly impacts the majority of the fields due to poor drainage and proximity to creeks and lakes. The Edina Soccer Club cancelled 825 practices and games due to the unusually wet spring.

Ms. Kattreh highlighted some significant facilities needing improvement that would greatly impact programs and associations. The first field highlighted is Creek Valley School Park, which happens to be on School District property but is maintained by the city. She estimated that changing to sand fields would cost \$450,000 per field. This is a primary facility for youth soccer programs. She also highlighted Cornelia School Park, where playability could be improved as well. She also highlighted Pamela Park, where \$2.3 million of improvements are needed, including a sand-peat field, a turf field, parking lots and lighting. Those improvements were originally slated within the city's CIP but were then removed.

Member Deeds thanked Ms. Kattreh for all the work put into the study of the fields. He expressed support in a combination of the two -- investments in the fields as well as the dome.

Ms. Kattreh provided an overview of the timeline moving ahead. She noted that City Council will have to decide whether bonding would be an option for the project. She added in 2017 the last park bond referendum will be paid off that was originally issued in 1997.

Ms. Kattreh stated there is the potential to add a couple athletic fields on the east side of Fred Richards Golf Course if the golf course is turned back into a park, but that is still very premature.

Member Jones agreed with Member Deeds' comments that this is an important thing to move forward on, but she does not want to see a net loss of playing fields; looking at it as a package is important. She encouraged looking into geothermal options to help reduce energy costs. She suggested a subcommittee within the Park Board to pursue other energy options and in particular what other communities are doing. Member Jones proposed the city seriously look into other funding methods or for a capital campaign. She noted the Hornet's Nest was a good example of private funding to the city and providing 25 percent of the project. That enabled the city to create a really nice facility. She suggested looking into private funding or naming rights so the city is not the only option for paying for capital expenses. She commended the work of the Parks and Recreation consultants; all of the recommendations from the June 18 feasibility study make a whole lot of sense.

Chair Steel thanked Ms. Kattreh and Ms. Miller for their efforts in putting all this information together.

Member Dan Peterson asked about rounds of golf played at the Fred Richards Golf Course. Ms. Kattreh stated that she does not know but that staff can obtain those numbers.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

VII.A. Council Updates

None.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Cella asked whether the summary results of the community survey will be included on the next agenda. Ms. Kattreh responded affirmatively.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh stated the Countryside Park project is moving along, after a delay due to the weather. The Golf Dome project is on schedule. The next project is storm sewer and water retention. The dome is still on schedule for a November 1 opening. Pre-construction meetings for the Garden Park baseball field are starting soon. The Community Garden parking lot construction starts the week of July 29. The other big project right now is the two-year budget, which is due on July 17.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Steel made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Ayes: Members Deeds, Jacobson, Gieseke, Steel, Cella, Jones, Dan Peterson.

Motion Carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.